

REMARKS

Objection to the drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to FIG. 1 as lacking a “PRIOR ART” caption. The caption has now been added, and a proposed new drawing sheet is being submitted herewith.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 7, and 11-14 under § 102(b) based on Ishida

Claims 1-3, 7, and 11-14 were rejected as being anticipated by EPO publication EP 0 622 969 A3 (Ishida). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However, to expedite examination of this application, independent claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended to require a first screen and a second screen that are oriented in two different planes, in which the plane of the first screen is substantially vertical and the plane of the second screen is inclined relative to horizontal. This configuration permits a user to create the effect of having a real meeting with a distant person. The user can keep his head in a vertical position while he looks at the screen displaying the distant person, and only needs to lower his head to consult data on the second screen. Ishida fails to disclose or suggest first and second screens in different planes. For example, in FIG. 25 of Ishida, there are three screens — a first monitor screen 6, a second monitor screen 2404, and a third monitor screen 103. As shown in FIG. 25, all three screens are oriented in the same plane. Thus, claims 1-3, 7, and 11-14 as amended are allowable over Ishida.

Rejection of claims 5, 8, 15-17, 19, and 20 under § 103 based on a combination of Ishida and Ludwig; and claims 16, 19, and 20 based on a combination of Ishida and Tucker

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 8, 15-17, and 20 based on a combination of Ishida and EPO publication EP 0898 424 A2 (Ludwig). The Examiner further rejected claims 16, 19, and 20 based on combination of Ishida and U.S. Patent No. 6,590,604 (Tucker). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, to expedite allowance of the application, independent claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended as described above. Because neither Ishida, nor Ludwig, nor Tucker teaches or suggests a first screen and a second screen that are oriented in two different planes, in which the plane of the first screen is substantially vertical and the plane of the second screen is inclined relative to horizontal, and

In re Appln. of Marc Berenguer
Application No. 10/521,713
Response to Office Action of December 29, 2005

because no combination of these references with one another can supply the missing claim elements, claims 5, 8, 15-17, and 20 as amended are allowable over the Ishida/Ludwig combination and the Ishida/Tucker combination.

Other rejections

Claim 4 was rejected based on a combination of Ishida and Cortjens, claim 6 was rejected based on a combination of Ishida and Arnott, claims 9 & 10 were rejected as obvious based on Ishida, and claim 18 was rejected based on a combination of Ishida, Ludwig, and Cortjens. Because these claims are all dependent claims, and because, as the Applicant has argued, the independent claims from which they depend are now allowable, it is submitted that these rejections have also been overcome.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1-20 of the present application are believed to be allowable. Thus, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Richard A. Wulff, Reg. No. 42,238
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: March 29, 2006

In re Appln. of Marc Berenguer
Application No. 10/521,713
Response to Office Action of December 29, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF DECEMBER 29, 2005 (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: March 29, 2006



Irina L. Mikitiouk

CH01/ 12468225.2

In re Appln. of Marc Berenguer
Application No. 10/521,713
Response to Office Action of December 29, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1.
FIG. 1 has been amended by adding the caption “PRIOR ART.”

Attachment(s):One (1) Replacement Sheet